

REMARKS

§ 102 Rejections

independent claims 1 and 8

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Acharya, (U.S. 5,903,559). Applicant submits, however, that Acharya does not disclose or suggest “multicasting data to at least one line card ...; and storing state information associated with the data as a default state at each line card the data was multicast to” as required by claims 1 and 8. Acharya may disclose establishing a “default route.” But, nowhere does Acharya disclose: “storing state information associated with the data as a default state,” much less that the state information is stored “at each line card the data was multicast to.” Therefore independent claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinguishable from Acharya. Applicant further submits that because claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9-14 depend from claim 8, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 8 are patentable.

independent claim 15

The Examiner also rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Acharya. Applicant submits, however, that Acharya does not disclose or suggest “a line card configured to store state information for multicast data as a default state; and a central controller unit configured to attach to the line card and configured to receive a packet included in the multicast data and to determine from the packet where to route the multicast data,” as required by claim 15. As argued above, nowhere does Acharya disclose or suggest “a line card configured to store state information for multicast data as a default state.” Therefore independent claim 15 is patentably distinguishable from Acharya. Applicant further submits that because claims 16-19 depend from claim 15, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 15 is patentable.

independent claim 20

The Examiner also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Acharya. Applicant submits, however, that Acharya does not disclose or suggest "receiving multicast data including unknown state information," and "storing the multicast data with default state information," as required by claim 20. Even if, for the sake of argument, Acharya's "default route," "default path" or "default virtual channel" could be interpreted as "default state information," nowhere does Acharya disclose or suggest storing this information with "multicast data including unknown state information." Therefore independent claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from Acharya. Applicant further submits that because claims 21-33 depend from claim 20, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is patentable.

independent claim 34

The Examiner also rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Acharya. Applicant submits, however, that Acharya does not disclose or suggest "installing a default state associated with multicast data in a data path of a line card; broadcasting the multicast data from the line card to all other line cards that the line card is configured to communicate with; and ... designating the line cards not included in the computed route as not to be broadcast multicast data received at the data path subsequent to the multicast data and having the same state information as the multicast data," as required by claim 34. Therefore independent claim 34 is patentably distinguishable from Acharya. Applicant further submit that because claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 34, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 34 is patentable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

Applicant : Yunzhou Li
Serial No. : 09/685,905
Filed : October 10, 2000
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 10360-075001 / 12335BA

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2004



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20839055.doc